

The Honorable James L. Robart

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Plaintiff,

V.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF  
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES;  
ALEX M. AZAR, in his official capacity as  
the Secretary of the United States  
Department of Health and Human Services,,

## Defendants.

NO. 2:20-cv-01105-JLR

**NOTICE OF PENDENCY OF  
OTHER ACTION**

Pursuant to Local Rule 3(h), Plaintiff State of Washington notifies the Court of actions currently pending in other jurisdictions or forums that involve all or a material part of the same subject matter of this case:

1. *Whitman-Walker Clinic, Inc. v. U.S. Dep’t of Health and Human Svcs.*, Case No. 1:20-cv-01630 (JEB); United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

Brief description of the action: *Whitman-Walker* plaintiffs are several individual and entity healthcare providers, two non-profit organizations that provide health-related services, and national associations of healthcare professionals. Plaintiffs allege that the Department of Health and Human Services' June 19, 2020 rule implementing Section 1557 of the Affordable Care Act

1 (Final Rule) violates the Administrative Procedures Act (APA), the Due Process and Equal  
 2 Protection Clauses of the Fifth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, and the Free Speech and  
 3 Establishment Clauses of the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

4 Statement of any relationship between the two actions: There is no relationship between  
 5 *Whitman-Walker* and this matter, except that both actions request that the Final Rule be stayed  
 6 or enjoined.

7 Statement of whether to transfer: Transfer should not be effected pursuant to  
 8 28 U.S.C. § 1407 (Multi District Litigation Procedures) because the two actions involve  
 9 different claims and different questions of fact regarding harm. The plaintiffs in *Whitman-Walker*  
 10 and this matter are different. As such, *Whitman-Walker* is concerned with harm to the named  
 11 individual and entity plaintiffs, whereas *Washington* is concerned with harm to the state of  
 12 Washington, its agencies, and its residents. Further, the *Whitman-Walker* claims go beyond those  
 13 that are alleged here. *Whitman-Walker* challenges the Final Rule's elimination of a unitary  
 14 enforcement scheme that *Washington* does not; and *Whitman-Walker* brings claims that  
 15 *Washington* does not, namely the Free Speech and Establishment Clause claims under the First  
 16 Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

17 Statement regarding whether coordination between the actions might avoid conflicts,  
 18 conserve resources and promote an efficient determination of the action: Because the actions  
 19 challenge different provisions of the Final Rule involve different claims and different types of  
 20 harm, coordination would not avoid conflicts or conserve resources.

21 2. *Asapansa-Johnson Walker v. Azar II*, Case No. 1:20-cv-02834-FB-SMG; United States  
 22 District Court for the Eastern District of New York.

23 Brief description of the action: Plaintiffs are two individuals. Plaintiffs allege that the  
 24 Department of Health and Human Services' Final Rule violates the APA and the Equal  
 25 Protection Clauses of the Fifth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

1       Statement of any relationship between the two actions: There is no relationship between  
 2 *Walker* and this matter, except that both actions request that the Final Rule be enjoined.

3       Statement of whether to transfer: Transfer should not be effected pursuant to  
 4 28 U.S.C. § 1407 (Multi District Litigation Procedures) because the two actions involve  
 5 different claims and different questions of fact regarding harm. *Walker* challenges only the  
 6 provisions of the Final Rule that remove protections for LGBTQ persons. *Washington* challenges  
 7 a broader set of provisions in the Final Rule, including the Final Rule's rollback of covered  
 8 entities, LEP protections and more. Additionally, the plaintiffs in *Walker* and this matter are  
 9 different. *Walker* is concerned with harm to the named individual plaintiffs, whereas *Washington*  
 10 is concerned with harm to the state of Washington, its agencies, and its residents.

11       Statement regarding whether coordination between the actions might avoid conflicts,  
 12 conserve resources and promote an efficient determination of the action: Because the actions  
 13 challenge different provisions of the Final Rule and involve different claims and different types  
 14 of harm, coordination between the actions would not avoid conflicts or conserve resources.

15       3. *BAGLEY v. U.S. Dep't of Health and Human Svcs.*, Case No. 1:20-cv-11297-PBS;  
 16       United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts.

17       Brief description of the action: Plaintiffs are an individual, healthcare providers, and  
 18 entities that provide services related to healthcare. Plaintiffs allege that the Department of Health  
 19 and Human Services' Final Rule violates the APA and the Due Process and Equal Protection  
 20 Clauses of the Fifth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

21       Statement of any relationship between the two actions: There is no relationship between  
 22 *BAGLEY* and this matter, except that both actions request that the Final Rule be enjoined. The  
 23 plaintiffs in *BAGLEY* and *Washington* are different, and *BAGLEY* challenges provisions of the Final  
 24 Rule that *Washington* does not, such as the Final Rule's elimination of a unitary enforcement  
 25 scheme and required nondiscrimination notices.

1       Statement of whether to transfer: Transfer should not be effected pursuant to  
 2 28 U.S.C. § 1407 (Multi District Litigation Procedures) because the two actions involve  
 3 different claims and different questions of fact regarding harm. *BAGLY* is concerned with harm  
 4 to the named individual and entity plaintiffs, whereas *Washington* is concerned with harm to the  
 5 state of Washington, its agencies, and its residents.

6       Statement regarding whether coordination between the actions might avoid conflicts,  
 7 conserve resources and promote an efficient determination of the action: Because the actions  
 8 challenge different provisions of the Final Rule and involve different claims and different types  
 9 of harm, coordination between the actions would not avoid conflicts or conserve resources.

10      4. *State of New York, et. al. v. U.S. Dep't of Health and Human Svcs.*, Case No. 1:20-cv-  
 11 05583; United States District Court Southern District of New York.

12       Brief description of the action: Plaintiffs are 22 states and the District of Columbia.  
 13 Plaintiffs allege that the Department of Health and Human Services' Final Rule violates the APA  
 14 and the Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses of the Fifth Amendment of the U.S.  
 15 Constitution.

16       Statement of any relationship between the two actions: There is no relationship between  
 17 *New York* and this matter, except that both actions request that the Final Rule be enjoined because  
 18 various provisions violate the APA and the Fifth Amendment. The plaintiffs in *New York* and  
 19 *Washington* are different, *New York* challenges the Final Rule's elimination of a unitary  
 20 enforcement scheme that *Washington* does not; and *Washington* challenges the provisions of the  
 21 Final Rule that strip protections from discrimination on the basis of association with a member  
 22 of a protected class that *New York* does not.

23       Statement of whether to transfer: Transfer should not be effected pursuant to  
 24 28 U.S.C. § 1407 (Multi District Litigation Procedures) because the two actions involve  
 25 different claims and questions of fact regarding harm. Further, *New York* is concerned with harm  
 26 to the plaintiff states, which are distinct from the specific harms alleged in *Washington* to that

1 state's agencies and residents. It would be inconvenient to the parties and witnesses to litigate in  
2 a different jurisdiction or forum.

3 Statement regarding whether coordination between the actions might avoid conflicts,  
4 conserve resources and promote an efficient determination of the action: Because the actions  
5 challenge different provisions of the Final Rule and involve different claims and different types  
6 of harm, coordination between the actions would not avoid conflicts or conserve resources.

7  
8 DATED this 21st day of July, 2020.

9  
10 Respectfully Submitted,

11 ROBERT W. FERGUSON  
12 Attorney General

13 *s/ Neal Luna*  
14 NEAL LUNA, WSBA No. 34085  
15 MARSHA CHIEN, WSBA No. 47020  
16 BRIAN SUTHERLAND, WSBA No. 37969  
17 Assistant Attorneys General  
18 Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Washington  
19 Wing Luke Civil Rights Division  
20 Office of the Attorney General  
21 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000  
Seattle, WA 98104-3188  
Phone: (206) 464-7744  
Marsha.Chien@atg.wa.gov  
Neal.Luna@atg.wa.gov  
Brian.Sutherland@atg.wa.gov